

REMARKS

Claims 25, 26, and 55-58 have been canceled. Claim 1 has been amended at line 3 to include the term "relatively" before rigid; Claim 10 has been amended at line 4 to include the term "relatively" before rigid, and at line 8 to include the term "relatively" before thin; Claim 38 has been amended at line 2 to include the term relatively before rigid. Claims 27, and 59 have been amended to include all the limitation of their respective base claims and any intervening claims. Claims 28 and 29 have been amended to correct dependencies necessitated by the cancellation of claim 25. Claim 60 has been amended to correct dependencies necessitated by the cancellation of claim 55.

In the Final Office Action dated August 24, 2005, at page 3, lines 1-5 the Examiner states:

In each of the independent claims (claims 1, 10, 25, 38, and 55) the Examiner had previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being unclear because of the term "relatively". In view of the amended claims and the Applicant's own specification, **the Examiner may have been incorrect by finding the claim unclear because of the term "relatively"** (Emphasis added).

Additionally, at page 3, lines 10-11, the Examiner asks:

Therefore, how is it possible for the cleaning implement capable of being both "rigid" and "dispersible"?

A cleaning implement can be both rigid and dispersible. For example, a toilet tablet designed to be placed in the toilet tank is a rigid puck that slowly disperses in the toilet water over a period of several weeks. A laundry tablet is a rigid puck that dissolves or disperses in washing machine during the first few minutes of the laundry cycle.

The inventive cleaning implement is likewise designed to have a "liquid soluble, relatively rigid engaging surface..." (specification at page 6, line 32)

Further, at page 7 under "Allowable Subject Matter" at paragraphs 6 and 7 the Examiner further states:

6. Claims 1-24 and 38-54 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph, set forth in this Office action.

7. Claims 27-28, 30-37, and 59-67 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112 1st paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-24, 38-54, 27-28, and 59-67 are allowable. Further, claims 29-37 now depend from amended claim 17 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 27.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

Date: November 23, 2005

Respectfully submitted

By: 

Richard Niehuser
Reg. No. 44,260